

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough search and examination of the present patent application.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 9-11, 14, 18, 19, 22-26, 29 and 30 have been amended to define applicant's invention. Claim 28 has been canceled. Applicant submits that the changes to these claims make explicit that which applicant believed to be already implicit and are not made for statutory purposes related to patentability.

It is noted that some of the drawings are objected to because they are blurry or contain unreadable text. As set forth in the Office Action, formal drawings will be provided upon issuance of the pending application.

Claim 14 stands objected to due to an obvious typographical error. Accordingly, claim 14 has been amended to overcome this objection.

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated over Smith ("Smith," U.S. Patent No. 6,192,407). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that features defined in independent claims 1, 14, 29 and 30, as amended, are not taught, suggested or disclosed by Smith. Since these features are missing from Smith, Smith cannot render the claims anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

The missing features in applicant's claims 1, 14, 29 and 30 include a "message" that is provided to a "plurality of intended recipients" of "electronic material." The missing features further include that the message includes a "hyperlink" that "each of a plurality of actual recipients of the message receives." The missing features also include an "internet web site" that is presented to a recipient of the message when the hyperlink is "selected in the message," and further wherein the internet web site includes a "second hyperlink that, when selected, provides access to the electronic material."

Instead of teaching these features, Smith "private" or "personal" trackable uniform resource locators ("URLs") for directed document delivery, in which each personal or private URL ("PURL") "uniquely identifies an intended recipient" (see Abstract, column 2, lines 26-28, column 14, lines 44-46). At column 15, lines 36-37, Smith states, "each generated personal URL (PURL) is then forwarded to each intended recipient 320." Smith describes his PURL to include a "recipient identifier 333" that "uniquely identifies the intended recipient" (column 16, lines 55-

56). Thus, and unlike applicant's claimed message that includes a hyperlink that is sent to a plurality of recipients, Smith's system requires that each respective, unique personal URL is sent to only one recipient. Applicant's claimed hyperlink provided in the message is preferable to Smith's personal URLs because, for example, the overhead associated with generating individual URLs and individual e-mail messages that contain respective URLs for each recipient for potentially millions of people is far too cumbersome. Evidence of the computer processing overhead incurred with Smith's system is well described at column 7, line 35-column 42, for example with reference to requirements of multi-threaded processing. In fact, Smith's preferred system requires use of "BFD" client software for both senders and recipients. The client software is installed locally on each sender's and recipient's desktop (column 12, line 33-column 13, line 30). Applicant's claims 1, 14, 29 and 30 have no requirement of client software and, as described throughout applicant's written specification, functions for senders and recipients alike who use standard internet web browsing software. This feature is implicit in applicant's claims that describe a "web site" that is provided to the user upon selection of the "hyperlink."

Also and unlike applicant's claims 1, 14, 29 and 30, Smith does not teach, suggest or disclose applicant's claimed "internet web site" that is "presented to a recipient of the message when the hyperlink is "selected in the message," and further wherein the internet web site includes a "second hyperlink that, when selected, provides access" to electronic material. Smith, instead, teaches that the PURL includes "a store item identifier [that] uniquely identifies which document a given recipient desires to obtain" (column 16, lines 49-51). When selected, a recipient of the PURL in Smith "accesses the document via the PURL" (column 15, line 42). Although Smith describes that the server has an opportunity to "determine" "actions" based upon the PURL, there is no teaching, disclosure or suggestion that an internet web site is automatically presented to the recipient and that the internet web site provides a second hyperlink, which, when selected, provides access to the electronic material.

Accordingly, applicant submits that features of claims 1, 14, 29 and 30 are missing from Smith, and, therefore, claims 1, 14, 29 and 30 cannot be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-13 and 15-27 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 14, respectively, and are patentable as well as because of the combination of features in those claims with the

features set forth in the claims from which they depend.


Claims 4, 7, 17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of applicant's admitted prior art to Concannon ("Concannon," U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0158612). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in applicant's admitted prior art to Concannon teaches, discloses or suggests the missing features described above. In particular, nowhere does Concannon's admitted prior art teach, suggest or disclose "a message" that is provided to a "plurality of intended recipients" of "electronic material." Further, Concannon's admitted prior art does not teach, suggest or disclose that the message includes a "hyperlink" that "each of a plurality of actual recipients of the message receives." Moreover, Concannon's admitted prior art does not teach, disclose or suggest an "internet web site" that is presented to a recipient of the message when the hyperlink is "selected in the message," and further wherein the internet web site includes a "second hyperlink that, when selected, provides access to the electronic material." Accordingly, applicant's claims 4, 7, 17 and 20, which depend directly or independent claims 1 or 14, respectively, are patentable. Reconsideration is requested.

For the foregoing reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING  
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH  
THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS  
FILING SYSTEM ON January 10, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Joel J. Felber  
Registration No.: 59,642  
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP  
1180 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8403  
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

DAM:JJF:ck